

From: IN%"ssila@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU" 11-DEC-1995 10:24
To: IN%"ssila@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU"
CC:
Subj: SSILA Bulletin #28

Return-path: <ssila-request@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
Received: from donald.uoregon.edu (donald.uoregon.edu)
by CCIT.ARIZONA.EDU (PMDF V5.0-5 #2381)
id <01HYOEIDD43K91XBBQ@CCIT.ARIZONA.EDU>; Mon, 11 Dec 1995 10:19:57 -0700 (MST)
Received: from darkwing.uoregon.edu (darkwing.uoregon.edu)
by OREGON.UOREGON.EDU (PMDF V5.0-5 #13764)
id <01HYOC9ZJRXCBZK8ZK8@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU> for
ssila-expand@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU; Mon, 11 Dec 1995 09:11:36 -0800 (PST)
Received: from darkwing.uoregon.edu (darkwing.uoregon.edu)
by OREGON.UOREGON.EDU (PMDF V5.0-5 #13764)
id <01HYOC9BBEZK8ZK8@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU> for ssila@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU; Mon,
11 Dec 1995 09:10:59 -0800 (PST)
Received: (from delancey@localhost) by darkwing.uoregon.edu (8.7.1/8.7.1)
id JAA16283; Mon, 11 Dec 1995 09:10:48 -0800 (PST)
Date: Mon, 11 Dec 1995 09:10:46 -0800 (PST)
From: Scott DeLancey <delancey@darkwing.uoregon.edu>
Subject: SSILA Bulletin #28
To: ssila@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU
Reply-to: ssila@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU
Message-id: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951211091022.13668B-100000@darkwing.uoregon.edu>
X-Envelope-to: collifitz, DEMERS, HILLK, jelineke, msaville, MRILLIE, PENFIELD,
rtroike, steele, wdereuse
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Comments: SSILA Bulletin

THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF THE INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES OF THE AMERICAS

*** SSILA BULLETIN ***

An Information Service for SSILA Members

Editor - Victor Golla (gollav@axe.humboldt.edu)
Associate Editor - Scott DeLancey (delancey@darkwing.uoregon.edu)

--Correspondence should be directed to the Editor--

Number 28: December 11, 1995

CONTENTS:

- 28.0 UPDATE ON THE SAN DIEGO MEETING
- 28.1 CORRESPONDENCE (Archiving Sensitive Materials; Catawba Tapes?;
Language & Violence)
- 28.2 SSILA BOOK EXCHANGE
- 28.3 LATEST ON "ENGLISH-ONLY": A SEPARATE PEACE WITH NATIVE AMERICANS?

28.0 UPDATE ON THE SAN DIEGO MEETING

The joint meeting of SSILA and the Linguistic Society of America will

be held at the Sheraton San Diego Hotel and Marina (formerly called the Sheraton Harbor Island), January 4-7, 1996. Also meeting concurrently will be the American Dialect Society, the North American Association for the History of the Language Sciences (NAAHOLS), and the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics. The times, locations, and details of all meeting events, including all SSILA sessions, will be included in the LSA Meeting Handbook that will be distributed to registrants in San Diego. The following sessions and events are the ones that will probably be of greatest interest to most SSILA members.

Thursday, January 4:

* The opening session of the LSA meeting will convene on Thursday evening, January 4, at 7:00 pm in Grand Ballroom B. It will be a colloquium on "Lessons from the Field: a Retrospective", organized by Margaret Langdon. The discussants will be Ken Hale, Leanne Hinton, and Pam Munro.

Friday, January 5:

* An open meeting of the SSILA Atlas Committee will be held on Friday, Jan. 5, 8:00-10:00 am, in Marina III. [The time given in the October LSA Bulletin is incorrect.]

* SSILA SESSION 1: Algonquian & Muskogean (Friday, Jan. 5, 9:00 am to 12 noon).

* The first LSA session on Field Reports/Endangered Languages will be held on Friday morning, Jan. 5, and will feature papers on: Tsez (B. Comrie & M. Polinsky); Dublin Irish (C. Cotter); Native speaker intuitions and the phonetics of stress placement (D. Everett, P. Ladefoged, & K. Everett); Mexican & Guatemalan sign languages (A. Guerra, A. Holzrichter, & Mirus); Scottish Gaelic (P. Morgan); Java (F. Mueller-Gotama & Musey (A. Shyrock)); and the laryngeal specification of fricatives (B. Vaux).

* "A Field Methods Course on Ingush (North Caucasian)", organized by Johanna Nichols, will be held on Friday, Jan. 5, 12 noon to 2:00 pm, in Marina II.

* SSILA SESSION 2: Athabaskan & Tlingit (Friday, Jan. 5, 2:00 to 5:00 pm)

* The SSILA Executive Committee will meet on Friday, Jan. 5, 5:00 pm, in Room 514.

* The LSA Business Meeting will be held on Friday, Jan. 5, 5:30 to 7:00 pm in Grand Ballroom B.

* SSILA SESSION 3: Mesoamerican Languages (Friday, Jan. 5, 8:00 to 11:00 pm)

Saturday, January 6:

* SSILA SESSION 4-A: Northwest & Eskimo-Aleut (Saturday, Jan. 6, 9:00 am to 12 noon).

* SSILA SESSION 4-B: South American Languages (Saturday, Jan. 6,

9:00 am to 12 noon).

* The LSA Committee on Endangered Languages will hold an open meeting on Saturday, Jan. 6, 12 noon-2:00 pm, in Marina III

* The LSA Presidential Address will be delivered by Emmon Bach on Saturday, Jan. 6, from 2:00 to 3:30 pm, in Grand Ballroom B. His topic will be "The Politics of Universal Grammar."

* SSILA SESSION 5: Languages of the Southwest (Saturday, Jan. 6, 3:30 to 4:40 pm)

* The SSILA Business Meeting will be held Saturday, Jan. 6, 5:00-6:00 pm, in the Spinnaker Room.

* Colette Craig will provide an update on the Bolivia Documentation Project on Saturday, Jan. 6, 6:00-7:00 pm in Room 514.

* SSILA SESSION 6: General Session (Saturday, Jan. 6, 8:00 to 11:00 pm).

Sunday, January 7:

* SSILA SESSION 7: Siouan and Mayan (Sunday, Jan. 7, 9:00 am to 12 noon)

* The second LSA session on Field Reports/Endangered Languages will be held on Sunday morning, Jan. 7, and will feature papers on: Romani (P. Bakker); Itelmen (J. Bobaljik); Ndumbea (R. Mopoho); Francoprovençal (N. Nagy); Mohave (S. Penfield & T. Cononelos); and Palestinian Arabic (K. Shahin).

Reminder from the LSA: If you plan to attend the San Diego meeting, please preregister for the meeting and make your hotel reservations. For more information and/or forms, please contact the LSA Secretariat: tel: 202/835-1714; e-mail: <zzlsa@gallua.gallaudet.edu>. Hotel reservations may also be made by phone at (619) 692-2265 and (800) 325-3535. The special rates for the meeting are \$79 single, \$86 double. Reservations are subject to availability if received after December 14.

28.1 CORRESPONDENCE

Archiving Sensitive Materials

>From William Poser, 30 Nov 1995:

I endorse Joel Sherzer's recommendation for archiving field materials and commend him for his almost heroic efforts in the case of Kuna. However, I think that sometimes it is not so simple, because raw field materials may contain information that cannot be freely distributed.

Although most of my tapes are innocuous (except for the the embarrassment I might suffer from the revelation of poor technique or pronunciation), a fair number contain:

- (a) personal, political, or religious remarks that the informant would not want publicized. These include such things as allegations of sexual impropriety and of criminal activity that, if published, would be defamatory and potentially libellous;

- (b) information about shamanism that is not public knowledge;

- (c) traditional stories which I have not been authorized to publish.

I also have notes that contain information on matters that are not inherently secret but that cannot at present be distributed for political and legal reasons.

This is probably a fairly common problem. If such materials are to be archived by means other than keeping one copy at home and another at the office, there must be a system for controlling (and in some cases severely restricting) access to archival material. Can anyone summarize for us the sorts of access restriction that can be imposed by various archives? In some cases the most appropriate solution might be to edit out the problematic material and to destroy the original tapes.

--First Nations Studies
U of Northern British Columbia
Prince George, British Columbia, V2N 4Z9, Canada
poser@unbc.edu

Catawba Tapes?

>From Sheila Shigley, 30 Nov 1995:

We are trying to track down copies of the Catawba language tapes recorded by Frank Speck. We have heard they are housed at the University of Pennsylvania museum. If there are any other known recordings of Catawba, we would be very interested in them as well.

--Hocak Mazijaci Language Program
1-800-492-5745
shigley@macc.wisc.edu

Language & Violence

>From: M J Hardman, 9 Dec 1995:

I will be teaching a course on Language and Violence next semester and am posting this in search of any ongoing/ completed research or other information that I may be unaware of. (I am not interested in *male-dicta*.) I will be focusing on the way English is constructed and used in everyday contexts to make violence the normal environment and even a good. I will be using the work of Suzette Haden Elgin, Ann Tickner, my own work on Derivational Thinking, and the work of Taylor and Miller on Gender and Conflict. I also have the excellent bibliography of Bill Gay of UNCC. I will be considering all levels of language structure: grammar, discourse, metaphor, etc.

I am especially in need of materials that show a nonviolent construction within a language and comparatively within a culture to use as contrast to English. For example, if I understand correctly, Navajo healing is the (re)establishment of harmony, while in English we *fight* an illness until we *conquer* it. The material I have does not fully explicate the way in which this world view is realized in the structure of the language, except, of course, for the word hozho.

I am not looking for a specifically pacifist world view; rather where

violence may be relevant only to particular times and places, not in an all day every day fashion. I am posting this to SSILA in hopes that there may be something available that I am unaware of. For example, on the audio-tapes of the 1989 Circumpacific Conference, Adeline Fredin, then president of the Colville Tribe, gives a formal paper and an informal talk. Behind her English words I can hear a nonviolent world view, but I do not know how that is constructed in the language of the Colville tribe. (This tape is valuable to me in teaching students to hear and to listen to other voices. If anyone should know of Fredin's whereabouts, please convey my gratitude, or let me know how I could convey such to her personally.)

I thank you in advance for any information you can give me. If there is enough interesting information I will post a summary.

--P. O. Box 12099
Gainesville, FL 32604
afn1122@afn.org

28.2 BOOK EXCHANGE

[If you are interested in obtaining one or more of the books listed below, send a message directly to the person who is offering it, indicating what you would be willing to trade.]

From: Tom Solomon <Solomon@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu>

I'm a cultural anthropologist and ethnomusicologist working in the Andean area, so I'd be interested in trading these for materials on Quechua or Aymara, or for "classic" ethnographic texts on the Andes (Tschopik, LaBarre, etc.).

Haas, Mary R. Language, culture, and history: essays by Mary R. Haas. 1978 cloth, 382 pp. [28 essays, mostly on Native N. American topics, a few on Thai, Burmese, etc.]

Kachru, Braj B. et al., eds. Issues in linguistics: papers in honor of Henry and Renee Kahane. 1973 cloth, 933 pp. [58 papers on a variety of topics, only 2 on Native N. American languages.]

Maud, Ralph. A guide to B.C. [British Columbia] Indian myth and legend: a short history of myth collecting and a survey of published texts. 1982 paper, 218 pp. [Does not contain any actual texts, but rather is a history of scholarship in the area and a useful bibliographic guide.]

Saxton, Dean & Lucille. Papago & Pima to English, English to Papago and Pima Dictionary. (O'thham-Mil-gahn & Mil-gahn-O'thham). 1969 paper, 191 pp. [Includes sections on grammar, alphabet, technical terms, dialects, related languages.]

Seiler, Hansjakob. Cahuilla texts, with an introduction. 1970 paper, 204 pp. [Texts of myths, tales, etc. with English translation on facing page, of a S. California language.]

From: Stephen O. Murray <keelung@itsa.ucsf.edu>

I'd like to find a "good home" for my copy of Mary Haas's Tunica (presentation copy to "Professor Kroeber"; I wish I could say that Theodora gave it to me, but the Berkeley anthropology library didn't accession it after her death and I got it).

From: Leslie Saxon <lsaxon@uvvm.uvic.ca>

I have a duplicate of Li Fang-Kuei's Chipewyan Texts.

From: Lyle Campbell <lingo10@ccc.canterbury.ac.nz>

I have an extra copy of Boas, Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part 2 (1922), which contains Sapir's Takelma, Frachtenberg's Coos and Siulawan, and Bogoras' Chukchee. I'd be happy to trade this for something I don't have.

From: Victor Golla <vgolla@axe.humboldt.edu>

I have some spare copies of a number of publications on California languages. I'd be particularly interested in exchanging these:

P.E. Goddard, Morphology of the Hupa Language (UCPAAE 3, 1905)
, Elements of the Kato Language (UCPAAE 11.1, 1912)
Geoffrey Gamble, Wukchamni Grammar (UCPL 89, 1978)
, Yokuts Texts (Mouton-NATS, 1994)
Harvey Pitkin, Wintu Grammar (UCPL 94, 1984)
James Crawford, Cocopa Texts (UCPL 100, 1983)

I also have a slightly defective extra copy of Geoff Kimball's Koasati Dictionary, and several similarly defective copies (2 pages missing) of my own Sapir-Kroeber Correspondence: Letters Between Edward Sapir and A.L. Kroeber, 1905-1925 (1984). I'd be willing to exchange these defective copies for just about anything, or even give them to interested people for the cost of postage.

Finally, I have a spare copy of Harry Hoijer et al., Linguistic Structures of Native America (Viking Fund Pubs. in Anthropology 6, 1946). This is the Johnson reprint, but looks very much like the original. Included in this classic volume are sketches of Greenlandic (Swadesh), Chiricahua Apache (Hoijer), (Comparative) Algonquian (Bloomfield), Delaware (Voege- lin), Hopi (Whorf), Taos (Trager), Yawelmani (Newman), Yuma (Halpern), Tonkawa (Hoijer), Chitimacha (Swadesh), Tunica (Haas), Nahuatl (Whorf), and Chipewyan (Li). I'll need something special in trade for this -- a nicely bound copy of Part I of Boas's Handbook, for instance.

28.3 LATEST ON "ENGLISH-ONLY": A SEPARATE PEACE WITH NATIVE AMERICANS?

[Our Washington correspondent, James Crawford, sends us another update on the progress of legislation in the U.S. Congress that would establish English as the official national language. As the debate moves forward, Jim grows more pessimistic about its outcome. He writes: "If my report leads you to sense that the English-only threat looms larger than at any time in the past decade -- congratulations -- you've gotten the message. Unfortunately, not many others have."]

The chances for passage of English-only legislation were apparently given a significant boost by the Dec. 6 hearing before the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee. Chances also seem enhanced for amendments that would exempt Native American languages from some of the bill's restrictions, unfortunately fostering a divide-and-conquer strategy against the legislation's opponents.

The committee heard testimony from eight witnesses in favor of S.356, the measure that would declare English the nation's official language and severely restrict the federal government's use of other languages for public business. No opposing witnesses were invited to testify. Senator Ted Stevens (R-Alaska), chair of the committee, announced his intention to convene a second hearing at an unspecified date "early next year" when other views might be heard.

Advocates for language-minority groups protested their exclusion from the hearing, describing it as part of a troubling pattern. Raul Yzaguirre, president of the National Council of La Raza, noted that when a House education subcommittee heard testimony on similar "Language of Government" bills last month, the Republican majority allowed seven witnesses in favor and only one against. "What are proponents of English-only so afraid of?" he asked. "That a balanced hearing will reveal the inherent flaws of this legislation?"

Held on a day when the U.S. role in Bosnia held the attention of most senators, the hearing attracted only three members of the Governmental Affairs Committee. Besides Stevens, two Democrats were present for part of the proceedings, only one of whom, Sen. Daniel Akaka (D-Hawaii), expressed reservations about S.356. Akaka began by agreeing with the proponents' goal of "promoting linguistic unity," but said he worried that an English-only mandate might be discriminatory and ethnically divisive. He announced his plan to introduce amendments that would limit the legislation's impact on Native American languages.

Sen. Stevens expressed his sympathy for the latter idea, noting his earlier support for the Native American Languages Act and the Alaska Native Languages Act. (These recent laws endorse, among other things, the policy goal of preserving indigenous languages and authorize small grants for that purpose.) It was not clear whether Sen. Richard Shelby (R-Ala.), chief sponsor of S.356, was equally amenable. Testifying before the committee, Shelby asserted that 323 languages are now spoken within the borders of the United States. If any of these are accommodated by government-sponsored programs he questions if "multilingual demands" will ever end. "If we choose to perform these federal services in several languages, how can we possibly say no to the individuals who speak Chinook Jargon or Micmac?"

Stevens made it clear that his support for the legislation reflects concerns about the growth of immigrant languages and about bilingual education, which — he charged — has sometimes denied English-speaking children access to schooling in their native tongue. Recalling his close friendship with the late Sen. S. I. Hayakawa, founder of the modern English-only movement, Stevens said: "I share Sen. Hayakawa's aversion to the Balkanization of California... [with its southern half becoming] a Spanish-speaking state. California has tried to resist that, and I think nationally we ought to resist that."

For more than a decade, language-minority advocates have maintained a united front against the English-only movement. While it is widely acknowledged that immigrants are the primary target of this campaign, Native Americans have also suffered from its legal and political fallout. This year, for the first time, some of the latter now believe that they might be wise to make a "separate peace" with language restrictionists. It is tempting to argue that indigenous languages, which predated English on American soil, have a prior moral claim that immigrant languages do not have, and that federal programs for Native Americans should therefore be exempted from any English-only mandate.

Sen. Stevens appears to be receptive to this logic and it is possible that other Western Republicans may be as well — e.g., Senators McCain, Domenici, Campbell, Murkowski, and Hatch. Because these senators have previously spoken out against English-only measures, opponents had felt that chances for defeating the legislation were better in the Senate than the House (where one bill, H.R.123, now has 191 co-sponsors, only 27 shy of the 218 votes needed to pass legislation). Now prospects are less clear, especially since no senator has stepped forward this year to stage a forceful attack on S.356. Still, the Senate vote is likely to be close. It could make a crucial difference if Native American groups drop their opposition in exchange for amendments to mitigate the bill's impact on their languages.

"English Plus" advocates argue that such a deal would be short-sighted.

First, there would be no practical way to exempt indigenous languages from all the legal effects of the English-only bills now under consideration. While it might be possible to shield some Native American programs, S.356 and H.R.123 would (despite their sponsors' denials) seem implicitly to repeal the Bilingual Education Act. This could prove devastating to American Indian and Alaska Native schools, which rarely have alternative sources of support for native-language programs. At present children from more than 70 Native American language groups are being served by federal bilingual education grants. When these grants are terminated, the programs are usually terminated as well.

Second, there would be no way to exempt Native Americans from the political impact of an English-only law. Xenophobes tend not to make fine distinctions. For many if not all English-only advocates, the intent is to harass and denigrate people who look, sound, and live differently from members of the dominant culture. Native peoples meet these criteria as well as Hispanic and Asian immigrants. Even if enacted in a purely symbolic form, with no legal teeth an English-only law would legitimate and encourage chauvinism toward all minority languages — e.g., when it comes time for Congress or state legislatures to appropriate money for language preservation programs. Public attitudes, now largely indifferent to the fate of endangered languages, would likely be harder to change or even become more hostile.

On other issues, the Senate hearing featured familiar arguments by familiar witnesses, including Sen. Shelby, Reps. Toby Roth (R-Wisc.) and Bill Emerson (R-Mo.), and Mauro Mujica, president of U.S. English, all of whom had previously testified before the House subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families. As in the House hearing, proponents recruited an array of first-generation immigrants to regale the committee with arguments about the importance of learning English in the United States.

Shahab Qarni, a Pakistani, told senators that, as a world language, English was the only thing that helped me survive when stranded in various foreign airports. Sayyid Syeed, a Kashmiri linguist, testified that learning English is now a Muslim "religious duty" since it has become the language of the Koran for non-Arabic speakers. Miroslava Vukelich, a Serbian immigrant, also described English as "spiritually uplifting" and argued that making it official would empower [Americans] to communicate and interact with one another and [avoid] the problems that confront the country of my birth, Yugoslavia. (She neglected to mention that most parties to the Bosnian conflict speak dialects of a single language, Serbo-Croatian.)

Few challenges were raised to the witnesses' testimony, except by Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-N.D.) in the matter of demographic claims being advanced by U.S. English. Citing census projections, Mujica said that the number of non-English-speakers is expected to reach 43 million, or 11.5 percent of the U.S. population, by the year 2050. But Dorgan referred to a letter from the Census Bureau, which reported there were 1.8 million non-English speakers (0.8 percent of U.S. residents) in 1990 and denied making any projections about future language use. Challenged to explain where he got his estimate, Mujica responded, "books and articles." Pressed harder, he conceded, "I couldn't tell you."

Without being challenged, Rep. Roth earlier made a more extravagant claim: that one in seven Americans do not speak English. Roth cited as his source the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. In fact, according to the census, approximately one in seven U.S. residents spoke a language other than English in the home in 1990.

(The latter population increased substantially between 1980 and 1990, as shown by an analysis of census data by Dorothy Waggoner, in her "Numbers and Needs" newsletter, Nov. 1995. [For a copy, write Waggoner at: Box G1H/B, 3900 Watson Place, Washington, DC 20016.] But among foreign-born residents who speak other languages at home, the percentage who speak English "very well" increased more rapidly -- i.e., they are becoming more bilingual.)

--James Crawford
JMCRAWFORD@delphi.com

THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF THE INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES OF THE AMERICAS

Victor Golla
Secretary-Treasurer &
Editor, SSILA Newsletter

Dept. of Ethnic Studies
Humboldt State University
Arcata, California 95521
USA

707/826-4324 - fax: 707/826-4418 - e-mail: gollav@axe.humboldt.edu
